

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-9 and 11-13 were examined and reported in the Office Action. Claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected. Claims 5 and 12-13 are canceled. Claim 1 is amended. New claims 14-15 are added. Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 14-15 remain. New claim 15 is claim 5 amended to correct typographical errors in the equation. No new matter is added.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 102**

**A.** It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by *New Identification based weighted  $H^\infty$  norm approximation scheme and its applications to controller reduction*, D. Kavaranoğlu et al, ("Kavaranoğlu").

It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 12 is objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 12 rewritten in independent form. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Additionally, claim 4 directly depends on amended claim 1, and is therefore allowable for the same reason. Thus, the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections are moot.

**B.** It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by *A Mixed optimization approach to multiobjective computeraided control system design*, J. F. Whidborne et al, ("Whidborne"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

As asserted above in section I(A), claim 1 is now allowable. Additionally, claims 2 and 4 directly depend on amended claim 1, and are therefore allowable for the same reason. Thus, the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections are moot.

**C.** It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by *Uncertainty Weight Selection for  $H^\infty$  and  $\mu$ -Control Methods*, P. Lunström et al, ("Lunström"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

As asserted above in section I(A), claim 1 is now allowable. Additionally, claims 2 and 4 directly depend on amended claim 1, and are therefore allowable for the same reason. Thus, the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections are moot.

**D.** It is asserted in the Office Action that claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by *Hartly SIR number H1410* ("Hartly"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

As asserted above in section I(A), claim 1 is now allowable. Thus, the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections are moot.

**E.** It is asserted in the Office Action that claims 1, 2 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,230,062 issued to Shah ("Shah"). Applicant respectfully traverses the aforementioned rejection for the following reasons.

As asserted above in section I(A), claim 1 is now allowable. Additionally, claims 2 and 4 directly depend on amended claim 1, and are therefore allowable for the same reason. Thus, the above-mentioned 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) rejections are moot.

## **II. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's assertion that claims 3, 5-9, and 11-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended claim 1 by adding the limitations of claim 12. Additionally, Applicant has added new claim 14, which is claim 13 rewritten in independent form.

Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 14-15, as they now stand, are allowable for the reasons given above.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-4, 6-9, 11 and 14-15 patentably define the subject invention over the cited references of record, and are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in moving the case forward, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (310) 207-3800.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: December 13, 2005

By: 

Steven Laut, Reg. No. 47,736

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(310) 207-3800

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 on December 13, 2005.

  
Jean Svoboda